UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/052,661	01/23/2002	Willard Stephen Akers	9D-EC-19703	5561

7590 03/29/2005

Enrique J. Mora
Beusse, Brownlee, Bowdoin & Wolter, P.A.
390 North Orange Avenue
Suite 2500
Orlando, FL 32801

EXAMINER	
MADAMBA, GLENFORD J	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2151	

DATE MAILED: 03/29/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/052,661	AKERS ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Glenford Madamba	2151	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *23 January 2002*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-18* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-18* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *23 January 2002* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1, 9, 10, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Wu et al (hereinafter Wu), U.S. Patent 6,865,680.

3. Claim 1 discloses a method for securely and quickly interconnecting a web server **A, B...N** with a portable wireless communications device **33** **(Figure 1,** Col 3, lines 10-29), the method comprising:

providing a gateway **13 & 15** coupled to the server **A, B...N**, the gateway including a database **22** (Col 7, lines 40-45 & Col 3, lines 42-46; Figure 1) storing a plurality of

active session data uniquely identifying each of a plurality of users authorized to gain access to the server (Col 7, lines 40-48);

transmitting a present transaction request including a unique identifier from the wireless device to the gateway (Figure 2, Col 4, lines 59-66; Col 10, lines 9-18 & 34-37);

relating the present transaction request against the active session data in the database to determine whether or not the unique identifier in the transaction request matches a respective active session data (Col 11, lines 18-27; Col 12, lines 39-47);

in the event no match of the transaction request against any active session data is determined, transmitting a login screen so that, upon the user providing authentication credentials through the login screen, the user can proceed with the transaction request (Col 8, lines 60-64; Col 11, lines 5-27; Col 14, lines 19-27; Col 16, lines 42-63; also Figures 7 & 8);

in the event a match is determined, permitting the user to proceed through the transaction request without the user having to reenter the authentication credentials (Col 4, lines 38-42; Col 9, lines 5-12 & 24-28; Col 10, lines 53-67 thru Col 11, lines 1-5 and 46-57).

Claim 10 is rejected for the same reasons pointed out above as it differs from Claim 1 only by its statutory category.

4. Claim 9 identifies the method of claim 1 wherein the transaction request comprises a transaction request selected from the group comprising requesting an order of respective goods, requesting an order for services related to the goods, requesting order status information, requesting an order update, requesting information regarding the goods and/or services (Wu: Col 1, lines 6-10 & Col 1, lines 24-32).

Claim 18 is also rejected for the same reasons pointed out above as it differs from Claim 9 only by its statutory category.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claim 2, 3, 4, 5, 11, 12, 13, and 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wu in view of Rumsewicz et al (hereinafter Rumsewicz), U.S. Patent 6,832,255.

3. Claim 2 asserts the method of claim 1 wherein the active session data includes respective data fields indicative of time elapsed from the last transaction request by a respective user and a session time out value.

Wu, in his invention, discloses that a session-ID cookie is particular to a data session and is stored at the Gateway on behalf of a user for the life of a session (Col 12, lines 4-6) and that the auto-login server **21** (ALS) maintains the data session on behalf of the user operating hand-held 35 as long as a session is not terminated (Col 14, lines 55-57). Wu does not disclose that the active session data includes respective data fields indicative of time elapsed from the last transaction request by a respective user and a session time out value.

Rumsewicz, in a related invention, discloses a method and an interface unit for controlling access to a server by one or more clients. The unit includes a monitoring means which monitors resource usage of the server and admission means which allows a connection of one client to pass to the server if the connection forms part of an active session. The admission means also rejects or allows a new connection of another client to pass to the server in accordance with an admission control scheme.

In his disclosure, Rumsewicz teaches that when a new client connection is accepted by the interface unit for the server, an entry is added to an "Active Session Table" in the history database. The entry includes the time at which the last client-server interaction occurred. This interaction can be either a user request arriving or the transmission of information from the server to the client. If more than INACTIVE_SESSION_TIMEOUT seconds elapses between server-user interactions, the session is deemed inactive. This is an indication that the user is no longer interested in the server 6. Inactive sessions are removed from the Active Session Table (Rumsewicz: Col 5, lines 12-22).

Hence, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the active session data of Rumsewicz's invention, featuring a data entry for the time elapsed since a last transaction request by a user and a session timeout value, in order to maintain good throughput and efficiency for a server handling active sessions between clients and a server and to keep the server from getting overloaded due to too many connection requests at the server (Rumsewicz: Col 10, lines 60 thru Col 11, lines 1-10).

Claim 11 is rejected for the same reasons pointed out above as it differs from Claim 2 only by its statutory category.

4. Claim 3 asserts the method of claim 2 wherein the relating of the present transaction request to the active session data includes determining whether the time

elapsed from the last transaction request by that respective user is within the session time out value (Rumsewicz: Col 5, lines 12-22).

Claim 3 is rejected for the same rationale discussed above in #3 above for Claim 2.

Claim 12 is also rejected for the same reasons pointed out above as it differs from Claim 3 only by its statutory category.

5. Claim 4 stipulates the method of claim 3 wherein in the event the time elapsed from the last transaction request by that respective user is within the session time out value, the active session data for that user continues to be usable by the gateway (Rumsewicz: Col 5, lines 12-22).

Claim 4 is rejected for the same rationale discussed above in #3 above for Claim 2.

Claim 13 is also rejected for the same reasons pointed out above as it differs from Claim 4 only by its statutory category.

6. Claim 5 states the method of claim 3 wherein in the event time elapsed from the last transaction request by that respective user exceeds the session time out value, the active session data for that user is inactivated (Rumsewicz: Col 5, lines 12-22), and thus requiring the user to provide the authentication credentials through the login screen to

continue with the transaction request (Wu: Col 14, lines 55-57; Col 9, lines 55-59 & Col 10, lines 9-18).

Claim 5 is rejected for the same rationale discussed above in #3 above for Claim 2. Claim 14 is also rejected for the same reasons pointed out above as it differs from Claim 5 only by its statutory category.

7. Claim 6, 7, 8, 15, 16, and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wu in view of Lincke et al (hereinafter Lincke), U.S. Patent 6,397,259.

8. Claim 6 states the method of claim 1 further comprising mapping each transaction request into corresponding strings of compressed and uncompressed transactional code.

Wu, in his invention, discloses that his invention is in the field of Internet-based services and applications, and pertains more particularly to methods for providing an automatic login capability to websites accessed by users operating wireless Internet-capable devices (Wu: Col 1, lines 6-10). He points out that many companies offer various subscription services accessible via the Internet (e.g., banking, stock trading, shopping), and so forth from the comfort of their own homes via Internet access. Typically, a user, through subscription, has access to personalized and secure

WEB pages for such functions. By typing in a user name and a password or other personal identification code, a user may obtain information, initiate transactions, buy stock, and accomplish a myriad of other tasks (Wu: Col 1, lines 24-32). However, Wu does not disclose that the transaction requests are mapped into corresponding strings of compressed and uncompressed transactional code.

Lincke, in a similar endeavor, discloses a wireless communications system and method which provide packet minimized communications between a wireless client and a proxy server. The methods use novel data compression techniques to enable wireless communications devices to complete transactions by exchanging a minimum number of data packets. The compressed request message comprises a base document uniform resource locator followed by compressed data (Lincke: Abstract; Col 4, lines 43-63). He also discloses that the proxy server decompresses information from the wireless network side for use on the Internet side of the proxy server (Lincke: Col 11, lines 13-15).

Hence, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the data compression technique taught by Lincke with Wu's invention, in order to keep latency in wireless latency at a minimum by keeping the size of request data packets small (Lincke: Col 7, lines 64 thru Col 8, lines 1-7).

Claim 15 is also rejected for the same reasons pointed out above as it differs from Claim 6 only by its statutory category.

9. Claim 7 notes the method of claim 5 wherein the transaction request transmitted by the wireless device comprises at least one string of compressed transactional code (Lincke: Abstract; Col 4, lines 43-63).

Claim 7 is rejected for the same rationale discussed above in #8 above for Claim 6.

Claim 16 is also rejected for the same reasons pointed out above as it differs from Claim 7 only by its statutory category.

10. Claim 8 points to the method of claim 6 further comprising translating the at least one string of compressed transactional code transmitted by the wireless device into a corresponding string of uncompressed code for the requested transaction (Lincke: Abstract; Col 4, lines 43-63; Col 11, lines 13-15).

Claim 8 is rejected for the same rationale discussed above in #8 above for Claim 6.

Claim 17 is also rejected for the same reasons pointed out above as it differs from Claim 8 only by its statutory category.

Conclusion

1. The Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers in the references applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings of the art and are applied to specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant in preparing responses, to fully consider the references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the Examiner.

2. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Laursen et al, Patent No. 6233608, discloses a method for allowing thin devices to efficiently communicate ideas and transactions into data networks by using other devices with fill functional user interface in the networks. According to one aspect of the present invention, the thin device exclusively controls the authentication of a rendezvous that is associated with a user account in a server. The thin device running a micro-browser provisions the rendezvous with a set of credential information in an authenticated and secure communication session so that the provisioning process is truly proprietary. To access the

user account, the other devices equipped with well known browsers must submit the correct credential information to the rendezvous for verification in the server. Once admitted, the other devices can update managed information in the user account, individually and respectively, thereby the thin device is able to conduct desired transactions based on the managed information in the user account without the need to key in pertinent information of the transactions.

Liao et al., Patent No. 6480957, describes a method and system for establishing an authenticated and secure communication session for transactions between a server and a client wireless data network that generally comprises an airnet, a landline network and a link server in between. The client having limited computing resources is remotely located with respect to the server and communicates to the server through the wireless data network. To authenticate each other, the client and the server conduct two rounds of authentication, the client authentication and the server authentication, independently and respectively, each of the authentication processes is based on a shared secret encrypt key and challenge/response mechanism. Transactions between the client and the server are proceeded in the authenticated and secure communication session and further each transaction secured by a session key is labeled by a transaction ID that is examined before a transaction thereof takes place.

Aggarwal, Patent No. 6775298, discloses a method and apparatus for transferring data between a handheld device and a network over a wireless

communications link. A datapool manager breaks files into virtual blocks and adds the virtual blocks to a datapool. A communications manager converts the virtual blocks into transportation packets and controls the transfer of the transportation packets between the handheld device and the network. After a transportation packet is transferred, and acknowledgment is returned indicating that the transfer was successful.

Lee et al, Patent No. 6609150, describes a client-server systems and methods for transferring data via a network, including a wireless network, between a server and one or more clients or browsers that are spatially distributed (i.e., situated at different locations). At least one local client computer provides a user interface to interact with at least one remote server computer which implements data processing in response to the local client computer. The user interface may be a browser or a thin client.

Skog et al, Patent No. 6775262, describes a system and method for associating an MSISDN of a mobile terminal with a temporarily assigned IP address is disclosed. A first server located within a wireless communications network generates and transmits a start packet to a WAP network responsive to an access request by a mobile terminal. The start packet includes the MSISDN of the mobile terminal and an assigned IP address. A second server within the WAP network extracts the MSISDN in the IP address from the received start packet and stores this information together

within a database. When a WAP application is utilized, the MSISDN may be determined from the database and placed in an HTTP-header of packets to the WAP application.

3. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Glenford Madamba whose telephone number is 571-272-7989. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Zarni Maung can be reached on 571-272-3932. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

ZARNI MAUNG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Glenford Madamba
Examiner
Art Unit 2151